

that are important to our country, on issues that are relevant and, most importantly, on issues that provide the men and women, the professionals in whatever agency you're talking about, the tools and the direction that we are a Nation of laws. We have to respect our Constitution.

Mr. DREIER. At this point, Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to another hardworking, thoughtful member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, the gentleman from metropolitan Chumuckla, Florida (Mr. MILLER).

Mr. MILLER of Florida. I thank the ranking member for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to use my 2 minutes in a colloquy with the chairman of the full committee.

If you believe what you've just said, why are we striking section 506 from your manager's amendment?

Mr. REYES. If the gentleman would yield, last night, we offered a unanimous consent to withdraw it.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Reclaiming my time, why did you do that?

Mr. REYES. The issue, after reflecting on it, was, at least as I understood from the comments that were being made by your side, there were some misimpressions of what, actually, the amendment was intending on doing, so I offered to withdraw that under unanimous consent, and your side decided not to.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, again, please, I am going to continue the colloquy.

You are saying there are misimpressions on our side. It was your side last night that blew up when this issue was brought forward, and you didn't have the votes to do it. So my next question is: If you had defended it all-day long, why did you allow it to be put in the bill in the first place?

Mr. REYES. Well, we can only do so much to make sure that your side understands that the concerns that you were raising were not, in fact, what was meant by the amendment. That's the long and short of it.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Thank you, sir.

Reclaiming my time, that is exactly what I am trying to put forth to the public today.

You talk about our being entitled to our own opinions but not to our own facts. Facts are facts. The facts are the chairman of the committee had this put into the bill. The chairman of the committee is now having it pulled out of the bill, which is the way they want to go.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to my friend from Gold River, California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN).

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. I am sorry, I had to come over here and just respond to what was said by the chairman of the Intelligence Committee.

You said, in the previous administration, anything goes. Read the memo that just came out of the Justice De-

partment. Look at the actions of the Justice Department. They suggest that anything did not go. To say that now is to besmirch the reputations of good men and women who have worked both career and political to save us from the threat of terrorists since 9/11. To come here and to say "anything goes" is a continuation of besmirching the reputations of good men and women. Frankly, it ought not to stand. Look at the facts. Look at the recent memo that reviewed those analyses. You will see that is not the case.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the chairman such time as he may consume.

Mr. REYES. First of all, in response to my friend from California's comment, I will just give you one example.

The issue of waterboarding has been characterized as the equivalent of a training exercise, that the SERE training does it to train our pilots. Don't you think there is a big difference between categorizing it in that way and waterboarding an individual 183 times?

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. If the gentleman would look at the memo that just came out which reviews the legal analysis provided by the Justice Department in terms of waterboarding, you would see that there is not only a historic but a legal and substantial difference between the waterboarding referenced in the complaints versus that which we did.

Mr. REYES. Answer the question: Do you think there is a difference between a training exercise that simulates waterboarding?

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. I would be happy to respond if the gentleman would allow me to.

Mr. REYES. Please.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. There is no difference in the application—the numbers, yes.

The fact of the matter is, after that individual was waterboarded multiple times, we received actionable information from the intelligence community, which allowed us to stop plots that were aimed at killing Americans. That has been said under oath by the highest levels of the intelligence community in the United States.

Mr. REYES. Reclaiming my time, that doesn't deserve a response.

What I will say is that the FBI and our interrogators, the professionals that they are, have proven that you can get better information by following the traditional interrogation procedures. You don't have to resort to "enhanced interrogation techniques."

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. The facts are difficult.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday at the White House, Speaker PELOSI said that people sitting around the kitchen table don't care about process; they care about results.

Well, the fact of the matter is this has been an extraordinarily sloppy process. As we've just seen from the exchange that has taken place, it looks like we had the potential for very, very

serious, far-reaching results which could have been devastating had we included the McDermott language in this measure.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as we look at this pattern, it is unfortunate. I think we have made history here today by having the third rule considered for the first step of legislation. It has taken 8 months for us to get here when we should have dealt with it last summer when it was a priority for us.

I've got to say, Mr. Speaker, when you have had process, you end up with bad results, and that's exactly what has happened here. So I am very, very troubled that we are at this point, but we are going to try to do what we can to move forward.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I want to say that I am pleased we are removing the language today.

I want to remind my colleagues that, in this bill, we are helping to prevent the disastrous consequences that faulty intelligence and misinformed Congresses can have on national security. I urge a "yes" vote on the rule and on the previous question.

I yield back my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to House amendment to the Senate amendment to a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1299. An act to make technical corrections to the laws affecting certain administrative authorities of the United States Capitol Police, and for other purposes.

INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1105 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2701.

□ 1013

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2701) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2010 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes, with Mr. RAHALL (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Thursday,